



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/745,651	12/22/2000	Glenn D. Kirwin	CF/013	1536	
1473 75	90 08/16/2005		EXAMINER		
FISH & NEA	VE IP GROUP	KYLE, CHARLES R			
ROPES & GRA	AY LLP OF THE AMERICAS FL (	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
NEW YORK, NY 10020-1105			3624		
			DATE MAILED: 08/16/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		سمه						
		^/ A	oplication No.	Applicant(s)				
		0	9/745,651	KIRWIN ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	E	caminer	Art Unit				
			narles Kyle	3624				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	nication appear	s on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence ad	dress			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN nsions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comi period for reply specified above is less than thirty (i o period for reply is specified above, the maximum s ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a) munication. 30) days, a reply with tatutory period will ay y will, by statute, cau	. In no event, however, may a in the statutory minimum of th oply and will expire SIX (6) MC se the application to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely NTHS from the mailing date of this co ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	/. mmunication.			
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <u>10</u> June	<u>2005</u> .					
2a)□	•		ion is non-final.					
3)□								
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□	Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrict	are withdrawn 1			,			
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)[	The specification is objected to by the	ne Examiner.						
10)	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any obje							
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) includin The oath or declaration is objected to							
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
а)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority  2. Certified copies of the priority  3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation  See the attached detailed Office action	or documents had documents had of the priority onal Bureau (F	ave been received. ave been received in documents have bee CT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National	Stage			
Attachmen	at(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) 💢 Interview	summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice (3) Infor	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review ( mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 o er No(s)/Mail Date <u>July 22, 2005</u> .		Paper No	o(s)/Mail Date. <u>-08/2</u> 2005 Informal Patent Application (PTC	D-152)			

Art Unit: 3624

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-20, 22-26, 28-29 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,014,643 *Minton* in view of EP 0 665 489 A2 *Robertson et al.* 

As to Claim 1, Minton discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including in a method of submitting a trading command in an electronic trading system, the steps of:

Receiving a submission of a bid, offer, buy or sell command from a trader via a trading command entry interface (Col. 9, lines 18-24; "Buy" command, Fig. 4, ele. 418);

Presenting an interactive trading interface in response to the submission (Col. 10, lines 55-57) the interactive trading interface being displayed in response to (Col. 10, lines 54-57) any bid, offer, buy or sell command (Col. 10, lines 57-67, "Confirmation" of "Buy" command entered at Fig. 4; Fig. 6, ele. 620, 622, 624);

Positioning a pointing device pointer (Col. 6, lines 1-9; Fig 2.) over a button in the interactive trading interface corresponding to submission (Col. 11, lines 48-51);

Receiving a selection from the trader to confirm the submission via the interactive trading interface (Col. 12, lines 39-49; Col. 10, line 54 to Col. 11, line 51, particularly Col.11, lines 48-51; Fig. 6, ele. 606; see also comparable references to Fig. 7); and

Art Unit: 3624

Submitting the submission in response to the selection by the trader (Col. 11, lines 48-51).

In this instance, buy and sell orders are read as market orders; bids and offers are read as limit orders.

Minton does not specifically disclose automatic repositioning of the pointing device pointer over a button. Robertson discloses this feature at Abstract and Col. 1, line 35 to Col. 2, line 29. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the trading method of Minton with the addition of the automatic positioning feature of Robertson because this would have avoided additional manipulation of the pointing device. This advantage is specifically disclosed by Robertson at Col. 9, lines 53-57 and quoted below:

The system improves the efficiency of operation and enhances the functionality of cursor movement by positioning the cursor at a location that permits the user to perform additional functions without additional manipulation of the cursor control device 18.

As to Applicants' newly recited limitations and arguments regarding the prior art, as shown above *Minton* discloses the new limitations. Specifically, *Minton* discloses an interface to confirm a submission (Fig. 6, ele. 606) that is presented in response to a submission of a buy, command from a trader via the trading command entry interface (Col. 10, lines 54-67; Fig. 4, ele. 418; Col. 10, lines 53-67).

Applicant's phrasing in the second and third phrases of Claim 1 states that an *alternative* selection from one of bid, offer, buy *or* sell is received. Thus, the Claim language requires only that one of the selections be disclosed in the prior art. In the case of *Minton*, a "Buy" command

Art Unit: 3624

is received (Fig. 4, ele. 418). An interactive trading interface, (Fig. 6) is displayed in response in response to the "Buy" command, and thus meets the limitations recited buy the Claim. The phrasing of the selections is in the alternative and does not require more that the single command be disclosed with an interactive trading interface.

Concerning Claim 2, *Minton* further discloses displaying current bid and offer data in the trading command entry interface at Fig. 4. At Fig. 6, elements 620, 622 and 624 and Fig. 7, elements 720, 722 and 724, *Minton* discloses pieces of bid and offer data via the trading; these are received *via* the trading command entry interface in the sense that Figs. 6 and 7 are reached *via* Fig. 4. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receive a selection of a piece of bid and offer data as a submission of an order because this would have realized the improved efficiency of reduced pointing device movement cited in the paragraph quoted above.

As to Claim 4, Minton discloses bids/limit orders; these are specifically disclosed at Fig. 6, element 622. Submitting a bid as selection of this field would have been obvious because this would have realized the improved efficiency of reduced pointing device movement cited in the paragraph quoted above.

As to Claim 5, Minton discloses offers as limit orders; these are specifically disclosed at Fig. 7, element 722. Submitting an offer as selection of this field would have been obvious because this would have realized the improved efficiency of reduced pointing device movement cited in the paragraph quoted above.

Art Unit: 3624

With respect to Claims 6 and 7, see the discussion of Claims 4 and 5 and note that *Minton* discloses buy and sell commands as market orders at Col. 9, lines 31-36.

Concerning Claim 8, see the discussion of Claim 2 and note that *Minton* discloses the elements of a market cell at Fig. 4.

With respect to Claims 10 and 11, *Minton* discloses data and entry windows as Fig. 4. For entry features see Fig. 4, elements 418 and 426.

With respect to Claim 13, *Minton* discloses the use of a keyboard at Col. 3, line 65 to Col. 4, line 29. Further, Official Notice is taken that it was old and well known to use a command line interface for trading at the time of the invention. For example, prior to graphical user interfaces, command lines were the only screen interface available. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a command line interface in *Minton* because this would provide a familiar an quick means fro trading command entry.

Concerning Claim 14, *Minton* discloses use of a pointing device for submission of a t least a buy command at Fig. 4, ele. 418.

As to Claims 15-18, *Minton* discloses the buttons recited as set forth above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to automatically reposition a device pointer as disclosed by *Robertson* so as to allow for immediate selection of the button without requiring device movement.

As to Claim 19, see the discussion of Claim 1 above. Minton further discloses first and second trading interfaces at Figs. 4, 6 and 7 and related text. See also *Robertson* at Abstract, where first and second interfaces are disclosed.

Art Unit: 3624

Concerning Claims 20 and 22-26, see the discussions of Claim 19 and Claims 2 and 4-8.

As to Claim 28-29, see the discussion of Claim 19 and Claims 10-11.

Concerning Claims 31-32, see the discussions of Claim 19 and Claims 13-14.

Claims 3 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Minton* and *Robertson et al* as set forth above, and further in view of US 6,247,000 *Hawkins et al*.

With respect to Claim 3, see the discussion of Claim 2. *Minton* does not specifically disclose coloring fields in a trading interface. *Hawkins* discloses this limitation at Fig. 19 and Col. 20, lines 25-37. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Minton* with the coloring of trading information of *Hawkins* because this would provide additional status information for orders and expedite processing by traders.

Concerning Claim 21, see the discussion of Claim 20 and 3.

Claims 9, 12, 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Minton* and *Robertson et al* as set forth above, and further in view of *Harrington et al*.

With respect to Claim 9, see the discussions set forth above. *Minton* does not specifically disclose bid and offer data in the form of a spreadsheet. *Harrington* discloses this feature for securities trading at Col. 9, lines 4-11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the spreadsheet presentation of data disclosed by *Harrington* in combination with *Minton* because this would have provided an inexpensive and flexible way to present such data.

Art Unit: 3624

Concerning Claim 12, see the discussion of Claim 9 and *Harrington* further discloses use of web pages at Col. 6, lines 37-65 and Fig. 11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the web page presentation of data disclosed by *Harrington* in combination with *Minton* because this would have provided an widely accessible way to present such data.

As to Claims 27 and 30, see the discussion of the claim from each which depends and the discussion of Claims 9 and 12 above.

## Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments have been addressed above including arguments on dependent claims, which stand rejected as depending from rejected claims and adding no patentable distinction.

The rejections are maintained.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Kyle whose telephone number is (571) 272-6746. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on (571) 272-6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/745,651 Page 8

Art Unit: 3624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

crk August 12, 2005 Examiner Charles Kyle
Charles M